



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,759	11/12/2003	Gerald D. Cagle	2442	7815
7590	07/14/2005		EXAMINER	
Alcon Research, Ltd. Patrick M. Ryan(Q-148) R&D Counsel 6201 So. Freeway Fort Worth, TX 76134-2099			KIM, JENNIFER M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/706,759	CAGLE ET AL.
	Examiner Jennifer Kim	Art Unit 1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-8 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4-8,10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/26/2005

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed April 26 2005 have been received and entered into the application.

Action Summary

The rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanier et al. (Clinical Therapeutics, July 2002) of record in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 5,976,573) and further in view of Ray et al. (Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 1999) is hereby expressly withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 4-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanier et al. (Clinical Therapeutics, July 2002) of record in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 5,976,573) and further in view of Ray et al. (Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 1999) and Castillo et al. (US. Patent No. 6,743,439B1).

Lanier et al. teach the efficacy of combined fluticasone (nasal) and olopatadine (ophthalmic) in the treatment of allergic rhinoconjunctivitis (allergic rhinitis combined with allergic conjunctivitis). (abstract, conclusion). Lanier et al. teach the effective amount of olopatadine (0.1%) for the treatment of rhinoconjunctivitis. (page 1165 left-hand column third paragraph).

Lanier et al. do not teach the composition comprising olopatadine and fluticasone in a single nasal aqueous composition, specified particle size of fluticasone, pH and viscosity.

Kim teaches aqueous-based pharmaceutical nasal spray comprising fluticasone comprising recommended viscosity of about 50 to 200 cp. (column 5, lines 17-20, column 4, lines 3-5). Kim teaches the spray comprising the pH fall within the range of about 4.5 to about 7.5. (column 6, lines 58-65). Kim teaches the range of the fluticasone to be utilized in the spray is about 0.001 to about 2 %wt. (column 4, lines 20-27). Kim teaches the particle size of the fluticasone should be no greater than about 50 microns; preferably the particles have an average size of about 1 to about 20 microns. (column 4, lines 15-19). Kim teaches symptoms of allergic rhinitis include nasal itch, congestion, runny nose, sneezing and watery eyes. (column 1, lines 17-25). Kim teaches the aqueous nasal spray affords numerous and important advantages in the treatment of a condition that involves application of a medicament to the surface of the mucosa which line the nasal cavities by delivering a medicament readily to the many portions of the nasal cavities where it can perform its pharmacological function. (column 3, lines 15-25).

Ray et al. report allergic rhinoconjunctivitis a condition with allergic rhinitis combined with allergic conjunctivitis. (text).

Castillo et al. teach a composition comprising olopatadine for ophthalmic use may also be used and administered as topically as a nasal composition. (abstract, column 1, lines 60-65, column 2, lines 10-25, particularly, line 21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to formulate fluticasone and olopatadine in a single aqueous nasal spray formulation for the treatment of allergic rhinitis because Lanier et al. teach that both combined treatment

comprising fluticasone and olopatadine is effective and compatible for the treatment of rhinoconjunctivitis which includes the condition of allergic rhinitis as reported by Ray et al. and because the aqueous nasal sprays afford numerous and important advantages in the treatment of a condition including allergic rhinitis that involves delivering a medicament readily to the portions of the nasal cavities where it can perform its pharmacological function as taught by Kim. Further, the composition comprising olopatadine for ophthalmic use may also be used as topically and can be administrable as a nasal composition as taught by Castillo et al.

One would have been motivated to combine and formulate fluticasone and olopatadine in a single aqueous nasal spray formulation for the treatment of allergic rhinitis in order to achieve direct delivery of active agents readily to many portion of the nasal cavities and successfully treat the symptoms of allergic rhinitis including nasal itch, congestion, runny nose, sneezing and watery eyes by administer directly to the target nasal tissues in a convenient single formulation.

For these reasons the claimed subject matter is deemed to fail to patentably distinguish over the state of the art as represented by the cited references. The claims are therefore properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103.

None of the claims are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed April 26, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Applicants' amended claims recite a method of treating allergic rhinitis comprising intranasally administering a composition comprising olopatadine and a steroid selected from the list recited in Applicant's claim 1, but Lanier et al. does not disclose or suggest incorporating olopatadine into an intranasal composition and does not disclose or suggest incorporating olopatadine into an intranasal product for alleviating nasal symptoms. This is not persuasive because Lanier et al. teach the use of ophthalmic composition of olopatadine for the treatment of allergic rhinoconjunctivitis (allergic rhinitis combined with allergic conjunctivitis). (abstract, conclusion) and the effective amount of olopatadine (0.1%) for the treatment. Lanier et al. also teach the adjunct therapy comprising olopatadine and fluticasone for the same treatment. It is noted that ophthalmic composition of olopatadine is administrable nasally as well known by Castillo et al. Therefore, there is a motivation to combine and formulate fluticasone and olopatadine in a single nasal formulation for the treatment of allergic rhinitis in order to achieve direct delivery of active agents readily to many portion of the nasal cavities and successfully treating the symptoms of allergic rhinitis via nasal delivery. Applicants further argue that the selection of olopatadine as an anti-allergy agent to be combined with a steroid in an intranasal composition provides a special safety features that conventional anti-histamine agents do not and Brockman et al. concludes that olopatadine is unique because it does not cause non-

Art Unit: 1617

specific interactions with cell membranes that can lead to cell damage. The Brockman et al. has been carefully reviewed and considered. However, it does not teach the combination of fluticasone and olopatadine resulting in surprising and unexpected result compared to either of active agents singularly employed in treatment of allergic rhinitis. Thus, the claims fail to patentably distinguish over the state of the art as represented by the cited references.

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1617

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-0628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 6:30 am to 3 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sreenivasan Padmanabhan
Supervisory Examiner
Art Unit 1617

Jmk
July 5, 2005